

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO	. FI	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/889,755		10/10/2001	Ole Hjertholm	U 013557-0	U 013557-0 8934	
140	7590	02/23/2004		EXAMINER		
LADAS 8	k PARRY			PICKARD, ALISON K		
26 WEST	SIST STRE	ET				
NEW YOR	K, NY 10	0023		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
				3676		

DATE MAILED: 02/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

P 17.4	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/889,755	HJERTHOLM, OLE				
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Alison K. Pickard	3676				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address						
THE REPLY FILED 29 December 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appel Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this appliced in the substitution of the subst	cation. A proper re ch places the appli	ply to a cation in			
	EPLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of	•	- <b>6</b>				
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adverse, will the statutory period for reply expire later th ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dathave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensions of the shortened at the control of the shortened at t	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THI te on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 sion and the corresponding amount of the	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. \$ I36(a) and the appropriat e fee. The appropriate ex	See MPEP e extension fee tension fee under			
(b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three mo earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	·		may reduce any			
<ol> <li>A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant' 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF</li> </ol>	•					
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:					
(a) they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search (	(see NOTE below);				
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note by	pelow);					
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or	simplifying the			
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected claim	ms.			
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	etion(s):					
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely file	d amendment			
5.☐ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)☐ request fo application in condition for allowance because:		sidered but does No	OT place the			
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	ere newly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w	· · · · —	, ———	and an			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>15-21</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.				
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	•					
10. Other:						
	. ht	lesa Rei	Card			

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303) 09/889,755

Application No.

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The amendment will not be entered because Galle in view of Watts still reads on the claims and applicant's arguments are unpersuasive.